

REMARKS

By this Amendment, claims 1, 2 and 3 have been amended. Accordingly, claims 1-7 are pending in the present application.

Applicants wish to thank the Examiner for the indication of allowable subject matter in claims 2-4 and 6, and the indication of allowance of claim 7. In response, each of claims 2 and 3 have been rewritten in independent form so as to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims so as to secure the allowance of Claims 2-4 and 6. Indication of allowance of claims 2-4 and 6 along with claim 7 is respectfully requested.

Claim 1 stands rejected under 35 USC §102(b) as being anticipated by US Patent No. 4,673,902 to Takeda et al. Claim 5 stands rejected under 35 USC §102(b) as being anticipated by Takeda et al. or, in the alternative, under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Takeda et al. in view of US Patent No. 5,764,118 to Saito et al. Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections.

Among the limitations of independent claim 1 which are neither disclosed nor suggested in the prior art of record is a dielectric filter which includes “a respective single coupling electrode connected to each conductive through hole” wherein “each coupling electrode formed on the first surface of the dielectric block and extended to at least at a first edge of the dielectric block”.

While Takeda et al. is directed to a dielectric filter, it neither teaches nor suggests a dielectric filter as defined in independent claim 1. The Office Action contends that Figure 9 of Takeda et al. shows that a coupling electrode comprises elements 13a and 11k, and another coupling electrode comprises elements 13b and 11k'. Each of elements 11k and 11k' are not coupling electrodes, but rather are equipment connecting side electrodes.

Elements 11k and 11k' are equivalent to input/output electrodes, such as electrodes 5a and 5b shown in the present application. Therefore, each of the coupling electrodes 13a and 13b shown in Figure 9 of Takeda et al. do not form a "single coupling electrode connected to each conductive through hole" and "formed on the first surface of the dielectric block and extended to at least at a first edge of the dielectric block" as required by independent claim 1.

Saito et al. does not remedy any of the deficiencies of Takeda et al. Nothing within Saito et al. teaches, or even remotely suggests, a coupling electrode which extends to a first edge of the dielectric block as required by independent claim 1.

Therefore, even if one were to combine the teachings of Takeda et al. and Saito et al., one would not arrive at the present invention as defined in independent claim 1. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that independent claim 1 patentably distinguishes over the art of record.

Claim 5 depends directly from independent claim 1 and includes all of the limitations found therein as well as additional limitations which, in combination with the limitations of independent claim 1, are neither disclosed nor suggested in the prior art of record. Accordingly, claim 5 is likewise patentable.

The prior art made of record and not relied upon has been carefully reviewed. It is believed that this reference, either alone or combined with any other references of record, do not render the pending claims unpatentable.

In view of the foregoing, favorable consideration of the amendments to claims 1, 2 and 3, and allowance of the present application with claims 1-7 is respectfully and earnestly solicited.

Dated: November 5, 2003

Respectfully submitted,

By Richard LaCava
Richard LaCava

Registration No.: 41,135
DICKSTEIN SHAPIRO MORIN &
OSHINSKY LLP
1177 Avenue of the Americas
41st Floor
New York, New York 10036-2714
(212) 835-1400
Attorneys for Applicant